

Re: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

Brad Jackson to: Jon Richards

- 02/10/2011 01:34 PM

From: Brad Jackson/R4/USEPA/US

To: Jon Richards/R4/USEPA/US@EPA

What about Cardarelli?

Brad Jackson

----- Original Message -----

From: Brad Jackson

Sent: 02/10/2011 01:32 PM EST

To: Jon Richards

Subject: Re: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

We need to be certain.

Jon Richards

----- Original Message -----

From: Jon Richards

Sent: 02/10/2011 01:30 PM EST

To: Brad Jackson

Subject: Re: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

Wasn't very clear on usgs site. I will chk

Brad Jackson

----- Original Message -----

From: Brad Jackson

Sent: 02/10/2011 01:28 PM EST

To: Jon Richards

Subject: Re: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

Jon:

Is there a way to confirm if there's more recent surveys? Do you have the 1993 report? I'll also search when I get home.

Thanks, Brad

Jon Richards

----- Original Message -----

From: Jon Richards

Sent: 02/10/2011 12:56 PM EST

To: Brad Jackson

Subject: Re: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

my input below, even more then u wanted...

Jon Richards, Remedial Project Manager,
Federal Facilities Branch, Superfund Div, US EPA, Reg4
richards.jon@epa.gov
404/562-8648
c:770/853-7255



10804673

Brad Jackson

----- Original Message -----

From: Dawn Har...

02/10/2011 10:32:46 AM

From: Brad Jackson/R4/USEPA/US
To: "Jon Richards" <Richards.Jon@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 02/10/2011 10:32 AM
Subject: Fw: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article

Dawn Harris-Young

----- Original Message -----

From: Dawn Harris-Young
Sent: 02/10/2011 09:05 AM EST
To: Stan Meiburg
Cc: Franklin Hill; Carol Monell; Randall Chaffins; Derek Matory; Allison Wise; Brad Jackson
Subject: Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper inquiry - InsideEPA phosphate article
Hi Stan,

Here are the follow-up questions from Greg Martin w/ the Charlotte Sun Newspaper. Please advise on how you would like to proceed (written answers or interview).

Thanks,
Dawn

Dawn Harris Young
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
Office of External Affairs, Media Relations
phone (404)562-8421
fax (404)562-8335

"Service is the rent we pay for living" - Marian Wright Edelman

Hi Dawn,
Thanks again for this response to my inquiry. I still have a couple of questions I'd like to answer in my story.

1. What is the expected effect of phosphate mining on background radiation levels in the Central Florida area? *no effect to the overall background levels of central FL. Background radiation levels in undisturbed areas are the same as pre-mining and non-mining areas of FL, and not different from most of U.S. Any disturbed areas with phosphate near or at surface will potentially elevated levels of many metals and radionuclides, as would any mining waste.*

2. Is EPA arguing that the standard of 5 picocuries per gram of soil be applied, while Florida is suggesting 500 mrems? *The 5 pCi/g + the bkgd for Radium 226 is from 40 CFR 192, and if CERCLA is*

used at a cleanup site with Ra226, then it would apply at that site. FL Health Dept, has in past suggested a 500 mrem/yr radiation dose to public, from an old national guidance report, however, this is not in their state regulations.

3. Can you be more specific regarding how EPA is proceeding at this point. Are consultations with state officials scheduled? If so, how many and when? Is their time period in which EPA expects to reach a decision on aerial flyovers?

4. What does EPA think could be accomplished by the flyovers?

5. I've been told that USGS has conducted a flyover of the entire state to assay for uranium within the past couple of years. Is EPA

aware of that flyover survey? If so, was it not at a fine-enough resolution? USGS aerial surveys are probably from 1993 [though many date to early '70s, and some may be fairly recent], and are not meant to show resolution that would be required if characterizing an potentially elevated gamma radiation site

6. Why is this this project taking so long to resolve?

Thanks,
Greg Martin